## REMARKS

In response to the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C.§112, first and second paragraphs, the claims have been amended to delete the term "substantially". For this reason, it is requested that these rejections not be applied against the amended claims. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to delete the term "RO" and replace it with the term "oxides".

The references cited by the Examiner do not describe a glass ceramic that is free of  $P_2O_5$  and has a low coefficient of expansion.

The rejection for double patenting is based on the argument that the claims of the present application do not exclude  $P_2O_5$ . In view of the present amendment it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

James V. Costigan

Registration No.: 25,669

MAILING ADDRESS
Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 302-8989